



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*aw*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/870,836	06/06/97	HAMPAPUR	VIRAGE-10074

LM02/0719

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR  
620 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE  
SIXTENTH FLOOR  
NEWPORT BEACH CA 92660-8016

EXAMINER  
RAG, A

ART UNIT 2713	PAPER NUMBER
------------------	--------------

DATE MAILED: 07/19/00

13

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
08/870,386

Applicant(s)  
Hamapapur et al.

Examiner  
Anand Rao

Group Art Unit  
2713

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Anand Rao (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Mr. John Carson (#34,303) (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Jul 18, 2000

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-23 (and soon to be added claim 24)

Identification of prior art discussed:

US Patent 5,767,922 to Zabih et al., (hereinafter referred to as "Zabih").

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The following was discussed. After a further review of the Zabih reference it was determined the claimed method of the instant invention as reviewed in a proposed amendment overcomes the art of record, and would place the application in a favorable consideration for allowance, pending the entry of said amendment in a formal response. It is noted that in particular, the claims of the instant invention stress the operative limitation of "not updating the reference frame while going through a sequence of more than two frames, until the identification of a key frame has been made..." This feature is different from Zabih which constantly updates the reference frame even when identifying scene breaks over more than two frames (Zabih: figure 7).

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

ANDY RAO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

ANAND RAO  
PATENT EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 2713

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.